

And again:

"Imperial measurements seem to be the natural expression when it comes to creative writing. A seven-year-old describes in his Underground Adventure: 'I came to a molehill as big as a pond. It was 17 feet wide and 17 feet long. It must have been about a hundred and eleven feet deep.' And that from a child who had recently completed a page in a work book which required him to measure the height of the door, length of the classroom, width of his table and so on, in metres."

The schoolmistress who wrote this was not in any way anti-metric. In fact she seemed in favour of the system. She was just telling of her every-day experience with small children of the generation who are supposed to "know nothing but metric".

The present writer recently met a boy of 13 who actually believed that he knew nothing but metric. "I don't know the old measures at all," he said. "I don't know anything but metric."

A few minutes later, out of the blue, I said: "Look at that wall. How high would you say it is?" "Oh," he replied without hesitation "About three feet, I'd say."

Of course, when the time comes, we must campaign for a return to Imperial measures in our schools (that time is not yet). But in the meantime let us not be too despondent about the teaching of metric. For most children, if not for all, school is a very artificial environment, in which they learn all sorts of things which they will never remember later in life (how much French do most people know after heaven-knows-how-many hours of school-time spent on the language? Almost none unless they have had some other reason to use the language). The language of the classroom rarely impinges upon the language of the playground or of every-day life, and most children are as likely to describe a real wall in metres as to start a conversation about surds and tangents, or to call seawater a saline solution.

#### PROPOSED TACTICS

So what should we be doing to take tactical advantage of this situation? How can we use the fact that Imperial measures are the natural and normal form of expression for every one, young and old, to resist the tyrannical imposition of alien measures?

Remember, our campaign, like any campaign, has natural strengths and natural weaknesses. Our greatest weakness lies in the political arena. We are not, at this stage, going to get Parliament to stop pushing metrification, or to stop using compulsion on traders and public bodies. This is part of the price the Government—of either party—has agreed to pay for the dubious benefits of "Europe".

The greatest strength of our campaign lies in the people. The people, who have not been given a

vote on these matters, because both parties have agreed on them "above their heads". The people, who may be bullied and browbeaten, but are not likely to use metric measures in real life in the foreseeable future, if ever.

There, on the Home Front, is where we must begin to build. We must strengthen and develop the *natural* resistance of our people to alien measures. We must help to stop alien measures taking root, so that the ground remains prepared for the full and triumphant return of true English measures when the time comes.

To this end we propose to launch a "Don't Talk Metric" campaign to help strengthen the natural disinclination to use clinical-sounding foreign measures in everyday talk. We also propose to encourage rough conversions to enable people to talk in approximate Imperial measures at all times. We want to help people say "quart" instead of "litre", "yard" instead of "metre", "2lb" instead of "kilogramme" etc. Of course, when exactitude is required, one may have to specify "a French quart", but the important thing is not to use metric language. Remember that traditional measures have never been standardised. An Imperial quart is larger than a French quart, but an American quart is smaller than a French quart. Remember, metric is, before all else, an attack on our *language*, our *culture* and our *history*. That is why the extreme-modern type of person, who is committed to a rootless, bureaucratic present (like Mr. Heath and the new-style B.B.C.) is so violently in favour of it. Remember also that this kind of tower-block modernism is already becoming out of date. We are the post-modernists; the neo-traditionalists. We are the voice of the future. □

#### JOIN NOW!

THE Anti-Metric Society needs you! The annual subscription is £10-0-0 (though bigger donations are very welcome). We need your support in order to get anti-metric projects off the ground. We are planning to produce anti-metric stickers, fact sheets and regular journals to begin with and to publicise the campaign as widely as possible. Members will receive all published material as soon as it comes out and will be kept informed of developments as the Society gets under way.

I enclose £10-0-0 for membership of the Anti-Metric Society.

Mr./Mrs./Miss \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

County \_\_\_\_\_

Please make cheques payable to Perfect Publications. Our address is: Perfect Publications, B.M. Perfect, London W.C.1 (full postal address). (please write £10-0-0, not "£10.00" on cheque).

# Imperial RESISTANCE

"Don't Give an Inch"

## The Journal of the Anti-Metric Society

THE Anti-Metric Society has been formed to give practical expression to the feelings of the majority of British people about the replacement of our traditional British system of weights and measures by the ugly, alien metric system.

The people of this country were never asked whether they wanted this new, anti-traditional, un-English system imposed upon them. They were never asked, because every one knows what the answer would be. Instead, the system is forced on us, often by illegitimate back-door methods.

For example, in the 1970s, under Mr. Edward Heath (probably the single worst Prime Minister this country has ever had) an official-sounding body called the Metrification Board was established. This body busied itself by sending "directives" to various firms and organisations, telling them that they must "go metric" by such-and-such a date.

The Metrification Board had *no* official powers and *no* legal right to issue such directives, any more than you or I have. But of course most people were intimidated by this important-sounding body which had been "set up by the Government".

To combat this outrageous piece of fraud, an organisation called the Anti-Metrification Board was established, which campaigned effectively against metrification and helped to expose the bluff and deception of the Metrification Board. Partly because of this campaign, the Metrification Board itself was soon disbanded; and the Anti-Metrification Board, feeling its job to be done, was wound up.

*Since that time, there has been no organised body in this country to oppose the creeping tide of metrification.*

That is why the Anti-Metrification Society has been founded. We are not professional campaigners. We are like you: private individuals who feel that metrification must be opposed.

If there had been an anti-metric body in this country, we should simply have joined it and quietly given it our support (or, better still, given

it a bit of noisy support at times!). We could not do that because (as we found, rather to our horror) there was no such organisation. So we have had to set up our own. We hope you will support us. If you have a flair for organisation and would like to help us run the show, get in touch—we need you! If not, we hope you will join the Society and give it your full support—because without you, there will be no Society! □

#### AIMS OF THE SOCIETY

1. To provide an organised voice for the majority of the British people who deplore the destruction of our ancient and traditional Imperial weights, measures and money, which are as much a part of our valuable national heritage as any fine building or work of art.
2. To educate the public with facts and arguments for Imperial measures and *against* metric measures: especially to rebut the erroneous arguments that metric measures are "more scientific" or "more practical" and to awaken people to the irreplaceable cultural value of our traditional measures which are being wished away by Philistine bureaucrats, Eurocrats, planners and money-grubbers.
3. To campaign, where it seems appropriate, against further metric impositions, and, where it seems possible, for the withdrawal or relaxation of present ones. To find and publicise "loopholes" in metric legislation and to encourage traders, teachers and others to take full advantage of all such "loopholes".
4. To support, encourage and seek to advance the natural tendency of the British people *not* to use metric terminology in ordinary life. To keep alive the Imperial flame with a view to its complete re-establishment at a future time. To promote and publicise a "Don't Talk Metric" campaign.

5. To foster widespread understanding of the fact that the metric issue is essentially a question of heritage. Metrification is one of the many ways in which our cultural, national and historical identity has been systematically attacked since the 1960s. The mentality of the metricator is the same mentality as that of the developer who tears down a Georgian building to put up a high-rise concrete block. While concentrating primarily on the metric issue, we will encourage it to be understood in its wider context, will co-operate with kindred campaigns such as those for the recognition of our traditional Counties, and will work incidentally for the furtherance of other traditionalist causes. □

## THE EDUCATIONAL CAMPAIGN

WE must provide people with facts and arguments for combating metrification. Too many people give up hope because they believe that metrification is "inevitable", or that metric measures are "more scientific" than our Imperial measures. It is important that we combat such woolly ideas with real knowledge (as a matter of fact, many scientific and technical bodies are returning to Imperial measures, or use them "on the sly", because they are so much better for technical purposes than metric).

There are many arguments in favour of Imperial measures, but they break down into two main groups, the technical, and the cultural.

### THE TECHNICAL ARGUMENT

WE must make it clear that the much-touted nonsense about metric measures being more "rational", more "scientific" or "better for business" are entirely false. The system may have some advantages, but it has many disadvantages. One expert has summed up the position as follows:

"The metric system was instituted without regard to long-established practices. Measures derived from the artificial metre do not allow any important scientific unit to be expressed as a whole number. They are unfortunate combinations of non-ergonomic quantities to an invisible base that does not permit the ready formation of useful proportions or sizes."

Most "metric" countries use something equivalent to feet, inches and pounds in daily dealings, because these are more convenient (a "metric foot" is approximately a third of a metre — we say approximately, because one of the howling disadvantages of metric units is that they cannot be divided by three without producing a recurring decimal).

Napoleon, who enforced the metric system upon Europe, allowed the *système usuel* in Paris, by which a small addition was made to the old Paris foot to make it exactly one third of a metre (which is not, of course, a finite metric size).

This was then divided into twelve "metric inches" bearing, of course, no relation whatever to the metric system! Justifying this deviation from metric orthodoxy, the Man of Destiny commented "Twelve as a dividend has always been preferred to ten. I can understand the twelfth part of an inch, but not the thousandth part of a metre". This, from the man to whom the present use of metrics throughout Europe is entirely due.

The heresy was suppressed by law in 1840, a quarter of a century after Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo, but French craftsmen and engineers continue to use it to this day, wherever they can hope to avoid prosecution, because it is so much more convenient.

For most practical uses, pounds and ounces are far preferable to metrics. Take a pound of butter and divide it into two: you have two half-pounds (8oz). Divide one of those into two and you have two quarter-pounds (4oz). Divide twice more and you have ounces. The ounce, as every housewife knows, is a convenient size for weighing and measuring portions of food. Foreign cooks, in fact, use a "metric ounce" of 25 grammes, but how, starting with a "metric pound" of 500 grammes do you get to 25? After two halvings you are stuck with 125 which then has to be divided into five — almost impossible without resorting to measuring implements.

It is argued that the metric system is better for use with computers and calculators. This may have been true ten years ago, but today, when the pocket-calculator is in fact a miniature computer the manufacturers would not have the smallest problem in programming it to handle pounds and ounces, yards, feet and inches and pounds, shillings and pence. Any sixth-form pupil taking computer studies can easily write a short programme to enable any computer to do sums in yards, feet and inches, stones, pounds and ounces or any other system. It is just the sort of work computers are made for.

In fact, we can stand the usual argument on its head, and come to the real truth of the matter:

- The usual argument: *You cannot use Imperial measures in these days of computers, calculators and computerised cash-registers.*
- The truth: *The only problem with the Imperial system is the age-old one that it takes a bit more intelligence to work with different number bases (twelves, sixteens, twenties); but even that problem can be completely eliminated with the use of modern computers, calculators and computerised cash-registers.*

### THE CULTURAL ARGUMENT

YET even if it were true that the metric system is superior for practical purposes to our ancient Imperial measures — rather than being, as it is, a clumsy, inefficient, artificial system, eminently justifying the old definition of a camel as "a horse

designed by a committee" — even if the metric system was actually overwhelmingly better for the purposes of calculation, that would be insufficient reason for its adoption. Because the metric issue is really a *cultural* issue. What is at stake is not a tad more convenience in totting up quantities or a spot of minor conversion for international trading. What is at stake is something of immeasurably greater importance — our national and cultural heritage.

Let us make no mistake about it: metrification is first and foremost an attack on our culture and our history. Like decimalisation of the money; like the supposed abolition of the traditional Counties (though actually, the traditional Counties were never abolished, as more and more people are coming to understand); like the use of the 24-hour clock on railway timetables; like the building of hideous, blank-faced concrete buildings; metrification is just another part of the many-pronged assault upon our traditional loyalties, our national heritage; another of the things which are calculated to make us feel like strangers in a cold, inhuman mechanised world.

The economist C.H.Douglas spoke of the various movements of the 20th century, saying "A common factor is the appearance of plans everywhere designed to make people forget their historical attachments." George Orwell wrote in *Nineteen Eighty Four* of a world where history is forgotten and "nothing exists except an endless present" — significantly, metrification was an important factor in the tyrannical bureaucracy of *Nineteen Eighty Four*. Metrification, indeed, lends itself admirably to tyrants and bureaucrats everywhere, from the French Revolution onwards. It is the instrument of those who wish to cut the people off from their roots and force them into a world in which only the latest *diktats* have any reality.

Like most of these ugly, clinical, world-changing "reforms", metrification began to be enforced in earnest in the '60s and '70s when bureaucrats everywhere felt free to re-mould all things in their own image, when "rational planning", riding roughshod over all that was traditional, civilised and beautiful, was at the height of its worldly power — a power which had been growing steadily since the 18th century.

By the early '80s the cult had already-passed its peak. The high-rise tower-block is today a symbol of all that was wrong in the belief that people can be made to fit "rational" schemes devised in committee-rooms. Of course, it will be a long time before this hyper-rationalist phase has passed completely — it took centuries to grow, after all — but metrification today is already an idea which belongs not to the future but to a discredited past. Before long people will want to throw off metrification and preserve their cultural heritage in this area just as they do in the areas of architecture or the countryside. When the

mediaeval *Mappa Mundi* in Hereford Cathedral was nearly sold to foreign buyers, it was described as "an act of cultural vandalism". What else is the destruction of our ancient, elegant traditional measures for the sake (and for very limited advantage, too) of — foreign buyers?

The crude old idea that in questions of historic and cultural heritage, nothing matters but cold cash and vulgar economic considerations is rapidly growing out of date. We do not allow wide-boy developers to knock down Elizabethan country-houses now and build "shopping centres" in their place. Why should we allow wide-boy Eurocrats and businessmen to vandalise our ancient systems of mensuration for the sake of conglomerate profits or European colonialism? □

## THE POLITICAL CAMPAIGN

ON what fronts and by what means should we oppose metrification? Should we get up petitions and lobby M.P.s? Or is that a lost cause?

In our view it is not altogether a lost cause, nor can we tell what will happen in the future as disenchantment with the great European illusion begins to set in — which it will.

Let us be realistic and admit that, at present, the political front is not our strong point. That this will change in the middle-term future (i.e. early in the new century), many of us believe. What we should be doing at the present time is encouraging every sort of resistance to metrification; opposing every new act of metrification, and in general "maintaining a presence" so that we are ready to take more vigorous action when the tide begins to turn. □

## THE HOME FRONT

IF we are, at present, at a disadvantage in the political arena, on the Home Front our campaign occupies the high ground. British people do not "think" in metric and there is no sign that they are starting to. Metric measures are used for "official" purposes, but they are not used in every-day life. Some people worry about the new generation. "There are children growing up who will know nothing but metric". Fortunately, this is simply not the case. Let us quote from a recent article in *The Teacher*:

"Text books, work books and maths. equipment are based on the metric system, while the children's experience out of school is in Imperial units... .

"For instance, my class of seven- and eight-year olds measured one another and made a chart. Andrew, height one metre 30 centimetres, said next day, "My dad says I shall grow as tall as him."

"How tall is your dad?"

"Six feet one inch."

understood that, even though the British people are having metrication forced on them against their will, the 'European Parliament' was 'allowing' us to keep the pint and mile—"

Even if you cannot think of any such local examples you should still write a general letter, perhaps based on the following:

"Dear Sir, Slowly but surely Great Britain is abandoning her ancient system of weights and measures and adopting the metric system. Already I have to buy my petrol in litres; how much longer before milk is sold by them too? My coal used to come in half-hundredweight sacks, now they are 25kg. When will I have to buy potatoes by the kilogramme as well?

"As with so many of the changes that have been introduced since the war, the approval of the British people for the destruction of this part of our culture has never been sought and there is no reason why we should accept it. Readers can start by ensuring that they do not 'talk metric'. If buying material or something else sold by the metre, ask for so many yards. If something is sold in a half-litre bottle, refer to it as a pint.

"I also urge those who care to join the Anti-Metric Society. The Society, whose motto is 'Don't Give An Inch', seeks to halt and reverse the creeping imposition of metric weights and measures.

"Its membership includes many [like myself,] young enough to have been taught nothing but these ugly, artificial measures at school, who nevertheless realise that as well as being part of our heritage and culture, Imperial measures are more practical for everyday use.

"For details of the Society, please write to B.M. Perfect, London, WC1N 3XX."

Remember always to give the address of the Society.

If your letter is published, it is an idea to read the letters page for the next couple of weeks to see if there is any response to it. If some one writes in with opposing views, answer his letter with another to the letters page. In this way it

might be possible to get a useful debate started. If the letter contains points that you are not sure how to answer then telephone the Society (0865 777 290) and we will be happy to help you.

Please remember to send us a copy of any letter that is published.

### DON'T TALK METRIC!

Do not *use* metric units in conversation. If you must buy 500 grammes, call it a pound. If you must buy a litre, call it a quart. We shall be giving more information on rough equivalents later. If you need to differentiate between a *French quart* and an *Imperial quart*, do so, but often such precision is not needed. The important thing is to go on talking and thinking in civilised, traditional British units.

Remember: the battleground is the mind and you are in the front line.

### PERFECT PUBLICATIONS

As we have often said, metrication is part of a much wider attack on our language, our culture and our way of life. It is part of the great undermining process which has been going on since the 1960s. Perfect Publications upholds our traditional values and our English culture, publishing a number of magazines very different from the cynical, anti-traditional "mass-media" of today. Perfect Publications defends our language and our traditions, bringing you stories, articles, features and even comic-strips on every subject under the sun. Perfect Publications are bright, intelligent and witty (far better written than the so-called "quality newspapers" of the late 20th century). They are the model of a new style of journalism for a new-traditional future. Perfect Publications include *The English Magazine*, *The Romantic* and *Imperial Angel* and a subscription to all of them can be had at half-price by all members of the Anti-Metric Society. Free sample copies are also available to members of the Society upon request from Perfect Publications, B.M.Perfect, London W.C.1.

*The Anti-Metric Society, B.M.Perfect, London W.C.1.*

# Imperial RESISTANCE

## "Don't Give an Inch"

**The Journal of the Anti-Metric Society**

Patrons: Dr. Patrick Moore and Mr. Michael Wharton ("Peter Simple")

### METRIC—UNFIT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

OPPOSITION to metrication and the support of our traditional Imperial measures is, as we have said before, primarily a question of heritage. Arguments over which system is more efficient (and there are strong grounds for saying that Imperial is far more efficient) are really beside the point. The argument is really one of humanity against bureaucracy, traditional beauty against corporate philistinism, classical architecture against tower blocks. The "practical" arguments in favour of metrication have never been more than excuses or justifications. The real point of metrication is that it is an attack on our traditions by the sort of people who hate tradition just because it is tradition and want to force us to live in an all-new, committee-designed world in which the bureaucrat is a petty god.

Metric is the language of the bureaucrat. In a sub-committee report or a gas-board leaflet it looks as it should look: cold, practical and inhuman; it is alien to poetry, to human warmth, to decent conversation and to everything which constitutes the real life of real people. We can demonstrate this easily, by looking at the traditions of our language and literature, shot through by the rich, powerful, traditional language of Imperial measurement. Take the hauntingly beautiful old children's rhyme:

*How many miles to Babylon?  
Three score and ten.  
Can I get there by candle light?  
Yes, and back again.*

A verse like this would be utterly destroyed by substituting "How many kilometres to Babylon"; and not only because the metre would be ruined. Even if the word could somehow fit the metre, the use of a cold, alien, clinical word like "kilometre" in place of a strong, resonant traditional word like "mile" would be bathetic. Even the fact that "kilometre" does not fit the metre is no accident. Metric measures are unwieldy, artificial, pseudo-technical terms which do not fit easily into any traditional poetic metre. It is really only in comic verse that one could fit a word like "kilometre" or "millilitre" into the scansion. Take these lines from that beautiful poem, *Lapis Lazuli* by W.B.Yeats:

*Though Hamlet rambles and Lear rages  
And all the drop-scenes drop at once  
Upon a hundred thousand stages,  
It cannot grow by an inch or an  
ounce.*

Now, a "metric ounce" is 25 grammes, but it is probably fairer to suggest the lowest convenient metric units of size and weight, giving us "it cannot grow by a millimetre

or a milligramme", or, if you prefer, "it cannot grow by a centimetre or a centigramme". It is obvious that, quite apart from that fact that these words, however used, are too clinical to have anything but a ridiculous effect in a poem of this nature; they could not possibly be fitted into the metre by any means except the most absurd Lewis Carrollish gymnastics of versification, which would be wholly out of place in a dignified and lovely poem of this sort. "Metre" and "gramme" are possible metrically, but of course that means that smaller and larger quantities are both ruled out of poetry. In any case "metre" and "gramme" have not an ounce of poetry in them. They belong in the laboratory (where Imperial can still do a better job) rather than in the higher reaches of human language. One could, of course, use them in a comic parody of the verse, such as:

*Though Europe rambles and Heath  
rages  
And all the hacks pump out the sham  
Through speakers, screens and  
printed pages,  
We'll chuck the metre — and the  
gramme.*

But that is about the highest level of "poetry" that metric terminology can aspire to. The poetic use of Imperial measures is scattered about our everyday language. We talk of some one demanding his "pound of flesh" (from *The Merchant of Venice*). It is striking, and, if we think about it, a little shocking. But to speak of "500 grammes of flesh" hovers uneasily between the clinically disgusting and the plain absurd. Of course, we are not suggesting that any one—even a European committee—would seriously try to re-write our literature. The point is that these things demonstrate just how metric terminology is alien to poetry, and not only to poetry: to all warmth, depth, humanity and beauty in our language. Those who say that the Imperial system "belongs to the past" and the metric system "to the future" must

have a very cold, clinical, charmless future in mind. It is true, of course, that science fiction writers have often depicted the future as a cold, mechanised world, where warmth and beauty have no place. But is that what we want? Is that what any one really wants? A few social engineers and bureaucrats, perhaps—the sort of people who built the tower blocks; but the tower blocks are already a thing of the past, rejected by real people who want a decent, human, future which does not cut itself off from tradition. It is not only poetry which shows the cold absurdity of the metric system for purposes of human discourse. Take our children's playground-rhymes:

*Half a pound of tuppenny rice,  
Half a pound of treacle...  
What would the brave-new-world version  
of this be?  
250 grammes of two-pea rice,  
250 grammes of treacle...*

Ridiculous, isn't it? And note also how decimal money does not fit into these rhymes any better than metric measures. Most people have reluctantly accepted decimal money, but it has not become "naturalised" into our language. We still have (for a little while) "two pence", but the homely, friendly old adjectives like "tuppenny" are never used of the new money. It is not part of our real, living language, but an alien thing grafted onto it by a committee. None of us, even those who have grown up with it, quite knows how to talk about it. People talk uneasily of "one pence"; of course the expression is absurd, but every one knows the thing is not really a *penny*. The coins themselves have no homely reality for us. Take this:

*There was a crooked man  
Who walked a crooked mile  
And found a crooked sixpence  
Upon a crooked stile.*

A bureaucratised equivalent might be:

*There was a crooked man  
Who walked a crooked kilometre  
And found a crooked five-pea coin  
Upon a crooked stile.* 

## TAKING ACTION

# Writing to Your Local Paper

**Mr. John Jordan**, our energetic new membership secretary, has been writing to local newspapers up and down the country, bringing in scores of new members. Here is his guide to how it is done.

IN OUR fight to preserve our weights and measures it is essential that we gain as much publicity as possible. The letters sections of local newspapers provide excellent opportunities for us to get our message across and most local papers will print any letter that is coherent and succinct.

It is best to write a letter in response to something that has appeared in the newspaper. Even things which at first do not appear to have anything to do with imperial measures can be used as the basis for such a letter. For example, suppose that the paper has reported the intended demolition of an old building; you might start your letter thus:

"Dear Sir, Congratulations to the Evening Mail for bringing to our notice the proposed demolition of The Old Bakehouse. A civilised society should have

 Apart from the white-coated sterility of "kilometre", note the difference between the good, clear, warm vernacular propriety of a "sixpence" and the ungainly awkwardness of the modern currency. Apart from the fact that it ruins the rhyme by containing too many syllables (all these committee-designed units seem to be an indigestible mouthful); a five-pea coin has no warmth or homeliness, no existence of its own as something that can live in fairytale or nursery rhyme or in comfortable conversation. It is just a number, a quantity of cash. It has no personality. Not in a hundred years (in the unlikely event that

respect for its old buildings, recognising their value in providing a sense of continuity in a rapidly-changing world.

"Unfortunately, those in power often do not seem to have any sense of history or tradition. Just twenty years ago we abandoned the system of money which had been in use for over twelve hundred years and now we are in the process of discarding our equally ancient system of weights and measures—"

If you cannot find anything in the local paper which might serve as the reason for a letter (or if you do not read the local paper)—do not let that stop you writing to it, the next best thing is to find a local example of the use of metric units. For example:

"Dear Sir, I am surprised to see that the new footpath signs on the common give the distances in kilometres. I

it should last so long) will it ever be sung of in children's rhymes. A part of our heritage has been taken from us and replaced with something which cannot be used for anything except counting. It does not enrich our lives; our culture has been impoverished. They have taken our bread and given us a stone. Call it a shilling in your own daily life, and you are taking back with your own hands a little part of your cultural birthright. Refuse to use metric measures and you are preventing a theft from taking place in the first place.

*Beat the culture-vandals:  
Insist on Imperial.*